Non-coherent character of isoscalar pairing probed with Gamow-Teller strength: New insight into ^{14}C dating β decay

Yutaka Utsuno[a,b,*], Yoshitaka Fujita[c,d]

[a]*Advanced Science Research Center, Japan Atomic Energy Agency, Tokai, Ibaraki 319-1195, Japan*
[b]*Center for Nuclear Study, University of Tokyo, Hongo, Bunkyo-ku, Tokyo 113-0033, Japan*
[c]*Research Center for Nuclear Physics, Osaka University, Ibaraki, Osaka 567-0047, Japan*
[d]*Department of Physics, Osaka University, Toyonaka, Osaka 560-0043, Japan*

arXiv:1701.00869v1 [nucl-th] 3 Jan 2017

Abstract

We investigate the phase coherence of isoscalar pairs from the $B(\mathrm{GT}; 0_1^+ T = 1 \rightarrow 1_1^+ T = 0)$ values in two-particle configurations of $A = 6$, 18, and 42 nuclei and two-hole configurations of $A = 14$ and 38 ones. We find that these Gamow-Teller (GT) matrix elements are always constructive and thus enlarged under isovector- and isoscalar-pairing Hamiltonians, whereas the observed GT strengths are strongly hindered for the two-hole configurations, including the famous ^{14}C dating β decay. This indicates that the actual isoscalar pair, unlike the isovector pair, has no definite phase coherence, which can work against forming isoscalar-pair condensates.

Keywords: Gamow-Teller transition, Shell model, Isoscalar pairing, Phase coherence

1. Introduction

Pairing correlation is one of the most basic properties widely seen in quantum many-body problems including condensed-matter physics and nuclear physics. This is quite a common phenomenon caused by attractive interactions between constituent particles. In nuclei, the source of the attraction is short-range nucleon-nucleon forces, owing to which time-reversal pairs with large spatial overlap gain much energy and then a condensate of the Cooper pairs [1] occurs. Whereas isovector (IV) pairing (like-particle pairing) with $(J, T) = (0, 1)$ is firmly established for instance by extra binding energies in even-even nuclei, a condensate of isoscalar (IS) proton-neutron pairs with $(J, T) = (1, 0)$ appears quite elusive [2]. This is puzzling because mean attraction in the IS channel is much stronger than in the IV channel. Possible signals for IS-pairing correlation have been explored for instance in terms of binding energies, rotational responses, Gamow-Teller (GT) β-decay properties, and proton-neutron transfer amplitudes (see [2] for a review). Of particular interest is that IS-pairing correlation is predicted to be quite sensitive to double-β decay matrix elements [3, 4, 5, 6, 7].

A condensate of pairs is based on the formation of an energetically stable pair in two-particle configurations. Using a simple attractive force, Cooper has shown that the binding energy of the lowest-energy pair is much larger than the ones of the other eigenstates and also than the scale of two-body matrix elements [1]. This happens because a coherent combination of paired configurations—with a specific combination of signs—cooperatively works to lower energy [8]. Whether such a coherent IS pair is formed in nuclei may provide a key to elucidating the origin of elusive IS pairing, but much attention has not been paid to phase coherence.

In this Letter, we show that the IS-pairing interaction always causes a specific combination of signs in the lowest $(J, T) = (1, 0)$ state for any two-particle ($2p$) configuration and for any two-hole ($2h$) one and that the resulting $B(\mathrm{GT}; 0_1^+ T = 1 \rightarrow 1_1^+ T = 0)$ value is enhanced. While this property well accounts for the low-energy super GT state for $A = 6$, 18, and 42 [9], it fails to explain strongly hindered B(GT) values for the $2h$ configurations, including the famous ^{14}C dating β decay. This is a clear signature that the IS pair in reality does not take any definite signs, in contrast to what occurs for the ideal IS pairing. The IS pairing is thus fragile in nature, constituting an essential difference from the IV pairing which always favors definite signs and is thus robust.

2. GT strength in $2p$ and $2h$ configurations

We start with an overview of observed GT strengths in $2p$ and $2h$ configurations on top of the LS-closed shells. Hereafter we restrict ourselves to the initial and final states with the quantum numbers $(J_i, T_i, T_{iz}) = (0, 1, \pm 1)$ and $(J_f, T_f, T_{zf}) = (1, 0, 0)$, respectively. In Table 1, experimental $B(\mathrm{GT}; 0_1^+ \rightarrow 1_{1,2}^+)$ values are summarized for the p, sd, and pf shells. For the $2p$ configurations, one can clearly see that the B(GT) is concentrated in the 1_1^+ state for any valence shell considered, which is named the low-energy super GT state [9]. In contrast, the $2h$ configurations have a striking difference: most of the GT strength is exhausted by excited states, especially the 1_2^+ state. It is noted that the $A = 14$ case is well known for radiocarbon dating, which utilizes the very long half-life of ^{14}C, 5730 ± 30 yr, to determine the age of organic materials.

*Corresponding author
Email address: utsuno.yutaka@jaea.go.jp (Yutaka Utsuno)

Table 1: Experimental $B(\mathrm{GT}; 0^+_1 \to 1^+_{1,2})$ values for $2p$ and $2h$ configurations in the p, sd, and pf shells. Data taken from [10, 11].

	$2p$			$2h$	
	p	sd	pf	p	sd
	$A=6$	$A=18$	$A=42$	$A=14$	$A=38$
1^+_1	4.7	3.1	2.2	3.5×10^{-6} *	0.060
1^+_2		0.13	0.10	2.8	1.5

We examine how this strong asymmetry in GT strength between the $2p$ and $2h$ configurations arises in the framework of the shell model. The case of the p shell is now taken as an example, but similar discussions are applicable to other shells. In the shell model, $2p$ and $2h$ configurations can be treated in a unified way in terms of particle-hole conjugation, since particle-particle two-body matrix elements are identical with the corresponding hole-hole matrix elements [12]. The only difference between $2p$ and $2h$ configurations concerning the GT transition is single-particle energies. Keeping this in mind, we calculate the GT matrix elements by changing $\Delta\varepsilon_p = \varepsilon(p_{1/2}) - \varepsilon(p_{3/2})$, where ε stands for the single-particle energy. The values of $\Delta\varepsilon_p$ for the $2p$ ($A=6$) and $2h$ ($A=14$) configurations are 0.1 MeV and -6.3 MeV, respectively, taken from the CKII interaction [13].

For the two-body part, we first use the CKII interaction as a realistic one, and show the calculated GT matrix elements $M(\mathrm{GT}; 1^+_k) = \langle 1^+_k \| \sigma t^\pm \| 0^+_1 \rangle$ ($k=1,2$) in Fig. 1 (a). When the initial and final states are expanded as $|0^+_k\rangle = \sum_{ab} \alpha^{\mathrm{IV}}_{ab}(k) |abJ_iT_i\rangle$ and $|1^+_k\rangle = \sum_{ab} \alpha^{\mathrm{IS}}_{ab}(k) |abJ_fT_f\rangle$, respectively, $M(\mathrm{GT}; 1^+_k)$ is expressed by the sum of single-particle contributions as

$$M(\mathrm{GT}; 1^+_k) = \sum_{abcd} m_{abcd}(1^+_k), \tag{1}$$

where $m_{abcd}(1^+_k) = \alpha^{\mathrm{IS}\,*}_{ab}(k) \alpha^{\mathrm{IV}}_{cd}(1) \langle abJ_fT_f \| \sigma t^\pm \| cdJ_iT_i \rangle$. For $\Delta\varepsilon_p > 0$, the $M(\mathrm{GT}; 1^+_1)$ value strongly enhances, well reproducing the observed GT strength for $A=6$. This quantity is very close to the sum-rule limit of $\sqrt{6} \simeq 2.45$ up to $\Delta\varepsilon_p \simeq 5$ MeV, and then gradually decreases to the $p_{3/2}$ single-particle limit of $\sqrt{10/3} \simeq 1.83$. For $\Delta\varepsilon_p < 0$, on the other hand, the $M(\mathrm{GT}; 1^+_1)$ value sharply decreases with decreasing $\Delta\varepsilon_p$. It crosses the $M(\mathrm{GT}) = 0$ line at $\Delta\varepsilon_p = -5.7$ MeV, thus accounting for the vanishing GT strength observed in the β decay of ^{14}C.

3. GT strength with pairing interactions

To probe pairing properties in the $2p$ and $2h$ configurations, it is interesting to compare those realistic shell-model calculations to the ones using the IS- and IV-pairing interactions. The IV- and IS-pairing interactions are equivalent to the $L=0$ part of the surface delta interaction (SDI) in the LS coupling, hence the simplest interaction of short-range central-force character. The IV- and IS-pairing interactions are defined

*For the ^{14}C→^{14}N β decay. The corresponding $B(\mathrm{GT})$ value for the ^{14}O→^{14}N β decay is 2.0×10^{-4}.



Figure 1: (color online). Calculated $M(\mathrm{GT}; 1^+_{1,2})$ for two-nucleon configurations in the p shell as a function of $\Delta\varepsilon_p$. No quenching factor is used. (a) The CKII interaction [13] and (b) the IV- and IS-pairing interactions are used.

as $V^{\mathrm{IVpair}} = G^{\mathrm{IV}} \sum_\mu P^\dagger_\mu P_\mu$ and $V^{\mathrm{ISpair}} = G^{\mathrm{IS}} \sum_\mu D^\dagger_\mu D_\mu$, where $P^\dagger_\mu = \sqrt{1/2} \sum_{nl} (-1)^l \sqrt{2l+1} [a^\dagger_{nl} a^\dagger_{nl}]^{L=0,S=0,T=1}_{M_L=0,M_S=0,M_T=\mu}$ and $D^\dagger_\mu = \sqrt{1/2} \sum_{nl} (-1)^l \sqrt{2l+1} [a^\dagger_{nl} a^\dagger_{nl}]^{L=0,S=1,T=0}_{M_L=0,M_S=\mu,M_T=0}$. Those jj-coupled two-body matrix elements are expressed with the Condon-Shortley phase convention as [14, 15]

$$\langle abJT \left| V^{\mathrm{IVpair}} \right| cdJT \rangle = G^{\mathrm{IV}} \chi^{\mathrm{IV}}_{ab} \chi^{\mathrm{IV}}_{cd} \delta_{J0} \delta_{T1}, \tag{2}$$

$$\langle abJT \left| V^{\mathrm{ISpair}} \right| cdJT \rangle = G^{\mathrm{IS}} \chi^{\mathrm{IS}}_{ab} \chi^{\mathrm{IS}}_{cd} \delta_{J1} \delta_{T0}, \tag{3}$$

with

$$\chi^{\mathrm{IV}}_{ab} = (-1)^{l_a} \sqrt{j_a + 1/2}\, \delta_{ab} \tag{4}$$

$$\chi^{\mathrm{IS}}_{ab} = \sqrt{\frac{2}{1+\delta_{ab}}} (-1)^{j_a - 1/2} \sqrt{(2j_a+1)(2j_b+1)} \times \begin{Bmatrix} 1/2 & j_a & l_a \\ j_b & 1/2 & 1 \end{Bmatrix} \delta_{n_a n_b} \delta_{l_a l_b}, \tag{5}$$

where a, b, c, and d stand for single-particle states with quantum numbers (n_a, l_a, j_a) *etc.*, and δ_{ab} is the abbreviation for $\delta_{n_a n_b} \delta_{l_a l_b} \delta_{j_a j_b}$. The strengths G^{IV} and G^{IS} are negative for attractive interactions, and here we set $G^{\mathrm{IV}} = -3.4$ MeV and $G^{\mathrm{IS}} = -2.8$ MeV so that $\sum_{ab\neq cd} |\langle ab|V^{\mathrm{IVpair}}|cd\rangle_{J=0,T=1}|^2$ and $\sum_{ab\neq cd} |\langle ab|V^{\mathrm{ISpair}}|cd\rangle_{J=1,T=0}|^2$ become those of the CKII interaction.

The results of the above pairing interactions are plotted in Fig. 1 (b). Similar to the CKII interaction, the enhancement of the GT matrix element from the single-particle limit occurs for

$\Delta\varepsilon_p > 0$. However, the trend for $\Delta\varepsilon_p < 0$ is completely different. The $M(\mathrm{GT}; 1_1^+)$ value decreases rather mildly as $\Delta\varepsilon_p$ moves away from zero. This is a monotonic decrease which asymptotically approaches the $p_{1/2}$ single-particle limit of $\sqrt{2/3} \simeq 0.82$ and never vanishes.

The essential feature of the pairing interaction shown in Fig. 1 (b) is that the $M(\mathrm{GT}; 1_1^+)$ value enlarges compared to the $p_{3/2}$ and $p_{1/2}$ single-particle limits for $\Delta\varepsilon_p > 0$ and $\Delta\varepsilon_p < 0$, respectively. This is caused by the constructive interference of $m_{abcd}(1)$ in Eq. (1), and such an in-phase character has been presented for the pf-shell case of ^{42}Ca [9, 10, 16] on the basis of numerical analyses using the shell model and the random-phase approximation. It is still not very clear, however, why the constructive interference occurs and whether it is realized for different valence shells.

In order to answer this question, we find a theorem concerning the sign of $m_{abcd}(1_1^+)$.

Theorem 1. *All of the $m_{abcd}(1_1^+)$ values are of the same sign for any valence shell and for any single-particle splitting when the two-body matrix elements are given by the pairing interactions of Eqs. (2) and (3) with negative G^{IV} and G^{IS}.*

Proof. We first consider the signs of the two-body matrix elements of Eqs. (2) and (3). Since the sign of χ_{ab}^{IV} is $(-1)^{l_a}$ [see Eq. (4)], all the matrix elements of V^{IVpair} can be negative (or zero) when one takes a phase convention $|\overline{abJ_iT_i}\rangle = (-1)^{l_a}|abJ_iT_i\rangle$. Similarly, for the IS pairing one can easily show that the sign of χ_{ab}^{IS} is $(-1)^{j_b-1/2}$, thus obtaining entirely negative matrix elements of V^{ISpair} with a phase convention $|\overline{abJ_fT_f}\rangle = (-1)^{j_b-1/2}|abJ_fT_f\rangle$. Hereafter we refer to those phase choices as pairing phase convention, and the components of the eigenvectors in this convention are expressed by $\bar{\alpha}_{ab}^{\mathrm{IV}}(k)$ and $\bar{\alpha}_{ab}^{\mathrm{IS}}(k)$.

Thus, when the IS- and IV-pairing interactions are taken, their off-diagonal Hamiltonian matrix elements in the pairing phase convention are completely negative or zero for any two-nucleon configuration, since single-particle energies do not change the off-diagonal matrix elements in the jj-coupling. For such matrices having non-positive off-diagonal matrix elements, it is generally true that all the components of the lowest eigenvector are of the same sign according to a version of the Perron-Frobenius theorem in linear algebra[†]. We thus obtain $\bar{\alpha}_{ab}^{\mathrm{IV}}(1) \geq 0$ and $\bar{\alpha}_{ab}^{\mathrm{IS}}(1) \geq 0$ for any (a, b). As shown in Table 2, the GT matrix elements between two-nucleon wave functions satisfy $\langle\overline{abJ_fT_f}||\sigma t^{\pm}||\overline{cdJ_iT_i}\rangle \leq 0$ for any (a, b) and (c, d) concerned, hence the same sign of $m_{abcd}(1_1^+)$.

This is a mathematically exact statement, and therefore provides a robust basis for the occurrence of the low-energy super GT state [9] in $2p$ configurations.

[†]One can easily prove this case by showing the expectation value of $\vec{v} = (+\alpha_1, \ldots, +\alpha_k, -\alpha_{k+1}, \ldots, -\alpha_n)$ is greater than or equal to that of $\vec{v}' = (+\alpha_1, \ldots, +\alpha_k, +\alpha_{k+1}, \ldots, +\alpha_n)$ for any $\alpha_i \geq 0$.

Table 2: GT matrix elements $\langle f||\sigma t^{\pm}||i\rangle$ in the pairing phase convention, where the two-nucleon wave functions i ($T = 1$) and f ($T = 0$) are denoted as (ab) by using $j_> = l + 1/2$ and $j_< = l - 1/2$. We present only the basis states i and f that appear with the pairing Hamiltonians.

i \ f	$(j_>j_>)$	$(j_>j_<)$	$(j_<j_>)$	$(j_<j_<)$
$(j_>j_>)$	$-\sqrt{\frac{2(2l+3)}{2l+1}}$	$-2\sqrt{\frac{l}{2l+1}}$	$-2\sqrt{\frac{l}{2l+1}}$	0
$(j_<j_<)$	0	$-2\sqrt{\frac{l+1}{2l+1}}$	$-2\sqrt{\frac{l+1}{2l+1}}$	$-\sqrt{\frac{2(2l-1)}{2l+1}}$

4. Phase coherence in the IS pair

As indicated by the above proof, the key to obtaining the constructive interference of $m_{abcd}(1_1^+)$ is that all the off-diagonal Hamiltonian matrix elements are of the same sign which causes phase coherence in the IS and IV pairs. We stress that only the signs are relevant. The simplest case of the phase coherence is found in the original paper of the Cooper pair [1], where all the off-diagonal matrix elements between paired electrons near the Fermi surface are taken to be $-|F|$ and all the diagonal matrix elements are zero. In this case, the lowest eigenvector is $(\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \ldots, \alpha_n) = (1, 1, \ldots, 1)/\sqrt{n}$, and the corresponding energy eigenvalue is $-(n-1)|F|$. The enhancement of eigenenergy compared to the off-diagonal matrix elements, called pairing gap, is due to the phase coherence. In nuclei it is well known that such a coherent pair is formed between like-particles. All the off-diagonal $(J, T) = (0, 1)$ matrix elements are indeed negative in realistic shell-model Hamiltonians of CKII, USD [17], KB3 [18] and GXPF1 [19]. Similar phase coherence in the IS pair is expected to be formed on the basis of the IS-pairing Hamiltonian, giving rise to the constructive interference of $m_{abcd}(1_1^+)$. In reality, however, the $2h$ configurations have nearly vanishing $B(\mathrm{GT})$ values as shown in Table 1, pointing to destructive interference. Hence, the coherent IS pairs are not always formed with realistic interactions because of the opposite sign in some of the $(J, T) = (1, 0)$ two-body matrix elements.

Taking the p shell as an example, we present in Fig. 2 an intuitive picture about the formation of coherent and non-coherent



Figure 2: (color online). Graphical illustration of the signs of $(J, T) = (1, 0)$ off-diagonal two-body matrix elements (represented as $\oplus$ and $\ominus$) in the pairing phase convention and the resulting signs of the lowest eigenstate. The p-shell cases using (a) the IS pairing Hamiltonian and (b) the CKII Hamiltonian are compared. The up and down arrows stand for positive and negative coefficients of $|v_i\rangle$, respectively.

IS pairs for the (a) IS-pairing and (b) CKII Hamiltonians, respectively, where the pairing phase convention is used. Now the lowest eigenstate is expressed as $\sum_i \alpha_i |v_i\rangle$ by using the basis states $|v_i\rangle$. Before proceeding to detailed discussions, it should be reminded that the negative sign of an off-diagonal matrix element between two basis vectors $|v_i\rangle$ and $|v_j\rangle$, denoted as h_{ij}, favors the same sign of α_i and α_j and a positive h_{ij} favors the opposite sign in the lowest eigenstate. Here we mean $|v_1\rangle = |\overline{p_> p_>}\rangle$, $|v_2\rangle = |\overline{p_> p_<}\rangle$ and $|v_3\rangle = |\overline{p_< p_<}\rangle$, where $p_>$ and $p_<$ are $p_{3/2}$ and $p_{1/2}$, respectively. As illustrated in Fig. 2 (a), the obtained coherent pair is quite stabilized by the IS-pairing Hamiltonian, since any combination of (i, j) satisfies the above rule. On the other hand, the CKII Hamiltonian has a positive h_{23} and negative h_{12} and h_{13}. In this case, there must be at least a combination of (i, j) that does not comply with the above rule, as illustrated in Fig. 2 (b). This is analogous to the geometrical frustration in magnetism [20], although the physical situation is rather different. The signs of α_i can no longer be uniquely determined, and the actual signs depend on the diagonal terms. For the $A = 6$ system, the values of h_{11}, h_{22} and h_{33} are close to one another, and then the same sign of α_1 and α_2 is realized because of $|h_{12}| \gg |h_{23}| \simeq |h_{13}|$. In this case $|v_3\rangle$ has a small amplitude of the opposite sign, hence contributing little to the eigenstate. The dominance of $|v_1\rangle$ and $|v_2\rangle$ of the same sign accounts for the enhanced B(GT) value. For the $A = 14$ system, h_{11} is higher than h_{33} by more than 10 MeV, so that the ground state is dominated by $|v_2\rangle$ and $|v_3\rangle$. The resulting signs of α_2 and α_3 are opposite because of $h_{23} > 0$, thus leading to the nearly vanishing B(GT) value.

In this way the favorable signs for $|ab\ J=0\ T=1\rangle$ in the IS pair are not definite and depend on the core assumed for realistic interactions whose off-diagonal $(J, T) = (1, 0)$ matrix elements are not completely of the same sign in the pairing convention. This is an essential difference between IV and IS pairing, and clearly works *against* forming an IS-pair condensate.

We point out that non-coherent IS pairs can be probed with pair-transfer strength, which is regarded as a good measure of IS pairing correlation [2]. The IS-pair creation and removal strengths are now defined as $|\langle J_f T_f |||D^\dagger|||J_i T_i\rangle|^2$ and $|\langle J_f T_f |||D|||J_i T_i\rangle|^2$, respectively, and we consider the transition to the lowest $(J_f, T_f) = (1, 0)$ state. By using the CKII interaction, the IS-pair removal strength from ^{16}O is only 5.3×10^{-3}, while the IS-pair creation strength on ^{4}He is 8.1. A similar strong asymmetry between the IS-pair creation and removal is also obtained for the *sd* shell.

Finally, we briefly survey the origin of difference in the signs of the off-diagonal $(J, T) = (1, 0)$ matrix elements between realistic interactions and the IS-pairing interaction. First we consider the central forces. Since the IS-pairing Hamiltonian is equivalent to the $(L, S) = (0, 1)$ term of the SDI, the dominance of the $L = 0$ central force is the source of the coherent IS pairs, as well as for the usual IV pairing. While the $(L, S) = (2, 1)$ term is absent in the $(J, T) = (0, 1)$ matrix elements, this term can modify the $(J, T) = (1, 0)$ matrix elements. In Fig. 3, the effect of the $(L, S) = (2, 1)$ term is presented for various orbital angular momenta l by using the SDI. In general, $\langle \overline{j_> j_>}|V|\overline{j'_> j'_<}\rangle$ and $\langle \overline{j_< j_<}|V|\overline{j'_> j'_<}\rangle$ matrix elements due to $L = 2$ are positive



Figure 3: (color online). (a) Diagonal and (b) off-diagonal matrix elements of $\langle \overline{ab}|V|\overline{cd}\rangle_{J=1,T=0}$ devided by l for the SDI, where the dashed and solid lines stand for the $L = 0$ and total matrix elements, respectively. The strength of the interaction is determined so that its $L = 0$ term can be the same as the IS-pairing interaction with $G^{\rm IS} = -1$.

with the SDI, and strong cancellation between $L = 0$ and 2 occurs especially for $\langle \overline{j_< j_<}|V|\overline{j'_> j'_<}\rangle$ with low l and l'. For $l = 1$, for instance, $\langle \overline{j_> j_>}|V|\overline{j_> j_<}\rangle$ still has a large negative value, whereas $\langle \overline{j_< j_<}|V|\overline{j_> j_<}\rangle$ vanishes. In addition, the $L = 2$ term gives rise to the opposite sign between $\langle \overline{jj}|V|\overline{j'_> j''_<}\rangle$ and $\langle \overline{j_> j_<}|V|\overline{j'_> j''_<}\rangle$ for $l' = l'' - 2$ and $n' = n'' + 1$, thus causing frustration among $|\overline{jj}\rangle$, $|\overline{j_> j_<}\rangle$ and $|\overline{j'_> j''_<}\rangle$ when $\langle \overline{jj}|V|\overline{j_> j_<}\rangle < 0$ is satisfied. We confirm that finite-range interactions lead to essentially similar results to the SDI by using the $V_{\rm MU}$ interaction [21], but some quantitative differences appear. For instance, the $\langle \overline{p_< p_<}|V|\overline{p_> p_<}\rangle$ matrix element, which is exacly zero for the SDI, is positive by taking only the $(S, T) = (1, 0)$ term of the $V_{\rm MU}$, and this matrix element can be positive or negative depending on the strength of the $(S, T) = (0, 0)$ term. It should be noted that the $(S, T) = (0, 0)$ term vanishes for zero-range interactions.

Another important source to change the signs of $(J, T) = (1, 0)$ matrix elements is the non-central forces. It has been pointed out by Jancovici and Talmi that phenomenological tensor forces are needed to account for the extraordinary long lifetime of ^{14}C [22]. It is worth mentioning that its microscopic

origin has recently been discussed from *ab initio* approaches [23, 24, 25, 26, 27].

In the present context, the ^{14}C lifetime problem is a manifestation of the non-coherent IS pair formed by the positive sign of $\langle\overline{p_>p_<}|V|\overline{p_<p_<}\rangle$ due to the $L \neq 0$ central forces and the non-central forces. This idea can readily be applied to other cases. For instance, the small B(GT) value for $A = 38$ (see Table 1) is caused by the positive sign of $\langle\overline{d_>d_<}|V|\overline{d_<d_<}\rangle$ made in a similar way to $\langle\overline{p_>p_<}|V|\overline{p_<p_<}\rangle > 0$. In contrast, the $\langle\overline{j_>j_>}|V|\overline{j_>j_<}\rangle$ matrix elements have always large negative values both in schematic and realistic interactions, thus causing the low-energy super GT state [9] in $2p$ configurations.

5. Conclusion

We have shown that the strong asymmetry in the $B(\mathrm{GT}; 0^+_1 \rightarrow 1^+_1)$ values between $2p$ and $2h$ systems is a clear signature that a coherent combination of $(J, T) = (1, 0)$ pairs is not necessarily formed. By introducing the pairing phase convention and the idea of frustration, we have presented a comprehensive but mathematically robust explanation as to why the ideal IS-pairing interaction always leads to phase coherence regardless of single-particle energies but realistic interactions do not. This is in sharp contrast to the IV pairing in realistic interactions, and may provide a key to elucidating the origin of elusive IS-pair condensates in nature. It is of great interest to investigate how modern microscopic effective interactions predict the $(J, T) = (1, 0)$ matrix elements in a wide range of nuclear shells and how the non-coherent effect changes observables in more complex nuclei, including double-β decay matrix elements.

Acknowledgement

Y.U. thanks M. Mori for fruitful discussions and N. Shimizu for his careful reading of the manuscript. This work was supported in part by JSPS KAKENHI, under Grant No. JP15K05094 and No. JP15K05104.

References

[1] L.N. Cooper, Phys. Rev. 104 (1956) 1189.
[2] S. Frauendorf and A.O. Macchiavelli, Prog. Nucl. Part. Phys. 78 (2014) 24.
[3] P. Vogel and M.R. Zirnbauer, Phys. Rev. Lett. 57 (1986) 3148.
[4] J. Engel, P. Vogel, and M.R. Zirnbauer, Phys. Rev C 37 (1988) 731.
[5] N. Hinohara and J. Engel, Phys. Rev. C 90 (2014) 031301(R).
[6] J. Menéndez, N. Hinohara, J. Engel, G. Martínez-Pinedo, and T.R. Rodríguez, Phys. Rev. C 93 (2016) 014305.
[7] J. Engel and J. Menéndez, arXiv:1610.06548.
[8] For instance, K. Heyde, *The Nuclear Shell Model* (Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1990).
[9] Y. Fujita *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. 112 (2014) 112502.
[10] Y. Fujita *et al.*, Phys. Rev. C 91 (2015) 064316.
[11] Evaluated Nuclear Structure Data File (ENSDF), http://www.nndc.bnl.gov/ensdf/.
[12] For instance, I. Talmi, *Simple Models of Complex Nuclei*, (Harwood Academic Publishers, Switzerland, 1993).
[13] S. Cohen and D. Kurath, Nucl. Phys. A 101 (1967) 1.
[14] J.A. Evans, G.G. Dussel, E.E. Maqueda, and R.P. Perazzo, Nucl. Phys. A 367 (1981) 77.
[15] A. Poves and G. Martinez-Pinedo, Phys. Lett. B 430 (1998) 203.
[16] C.L. Bai, H. Sagawa, G. Colò, Y. Fujita, H.Q. Zhang, X.Z. Zhang, and F.R. Xu, Phys. Rev. C 90 (2014) 054335.
[17] B.A. Brown and B.H. Wildenthal, Ann. Rev. Nucl. Part. Sci. 38 (1988) 29.
[18] A. Poves and A. Zuker, Phys. Rep. 70 (1981) 235.
[19] M. Honma, T. Otsuka, B.A. Brown, and T. Mizusaki, Phys. Rev. C 65 (2002) 061301(R); *ibid.* 69 (2004) 034335.
[20] For instance, R. Moessner and A.P. Ramirez, Physics Today 59 (2006) 24.
[21] T. Otsuka, T. Suzuki, M. Honma, Y. Utsuno, N. Tsunoda, K. Tsukiyama, and M. Hjorth-Jensen, Phys. Rev. Lett. 104 (2010) 012501.
[22] B. Jancovici and I. Talmi, Phys. Rev. 95 (1954) 289.
[23] A. Aroua, P. Navrátil, L. Zamick, M.S. Fayache, B.R. Barrett, J.P. Vary, and K. Heyde, Nucl. Phys. A 720 (2003) 71.
[24] J.W. Holt, G.E. Brown, T.T.S. Kuo, J.D. Holt, and R. Machleidt, Phys. Rev. Lett. 100 (2008) 062501.
[25] J.W. Holt, N. Kaiser, and W. Weise, Phys. Rev. C 79 (2009) 054331.
[26] P. Maris, J.P. Vary, P. Navrátil, W.E. Ormand, H. Nam, and D.J. Dean, Phys. Rev. Lett. 106 (2011) 202502.
[27] A. Ekström, G.R. Jansen, K.A. Wendt, G. Hagen, T. Papenbrock, S. Bacca, B. Carlsson, and D. Gazit, Phys. Rev. Lett. 113 (2014) 262504.